

The poll also shows that most Americans wish to limit welfare funds to single mothers, and to put single mothers on a work plan.

Those types of plans are being tested in several states, including Iowa and Wisconsin. The reform agenda is clogged, however, in the Washington political system.

A welfare system that puts people back to work, and aims to get them off welfare is a good idea. The only exception that should be added is that the system include some compassion.

One of the reasons welfare reform hasn't taken off in Washington has to do with political posturing.

Both Democrats and Republicans are turning the debate into a class issue. That's not where the issue belongs.

For example, both Democrats and Republicans make a major issue out of single mothers. Truthfully, however, single mothers make up only a small percentage of the welfare recipients.

Both sides also talk about welfare recipients as if they spend their lives on the dole. The truth, however, is that most welfare recipients move in and out of the system. A small percentage spend an extended amount of time on welfare.

A welfare reform plan that includes work or schooling instead of hand-outs is a good idea. Limiting welfare recipients to two years of benefits is also an improvement.

Both Democrats and Republicans have said they would support plans similar to those currently in use here and in Wisconsin.

But nothing will really happen until highly partisan politics are removed from the picture.●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1219

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the campaign finance reform bill scheduled for the morning of Tuesday June 25 be equally divided between the two leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION OF FORMER SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a Senate resolution submitted earlier today by the majority leader and the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 269) to authorize testimony and representation of former Senate employee in *Ward v. United States*.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in the case of *Ward versus United States*, a civil action for damages resulting from alleged improper disclosure of tax-return information by the Internal Revenue Service, the plaintiff has requested testimony from a former chief of staff to Senator BROWN. While he was employed

by Senator BROWN in the summer and fall of 1993, the former chief of staff provided consistent services to the plaintiff by contacting the IRS on her behalf. The plaintiff is seeking testimony from the former chief of staff describing his conversations with Internal Revenue Service employees. Senator BROWN believes that it is appropriate for his former chief of staff to submit an affidavit and to testify in this proceeding.

Mr. President, this resolution would authorize the former chief of staff to provide testimony in this case, and would authorize the Senate legal counsel to represent him.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that a statement of explanation be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 269) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 269

Whereas, in the case of *Carol Ward v. United States*, Civil Case No. 95-WY-810-WD, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, testimony has been requested from William T. Brack, a former chief of staff to Senator Hank Brown;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That William T. Brack is authorized to testify in the case of *Carol Ward v. United States*, Civil Case No. 95-WY-810-WD (D. Colo.), except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent William T. Brack in connection with his testimony in *Carol Ward v. United States*.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 153 that has just been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 153) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered and agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 153) was agreed to.

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, under the order of last night the Senate will reconvene at 1 p.m. on Monday, June 24. The Senate will be debating the campaign finance reform bill during Monday's session. However, no rollcall votes will occur during that day.

A cloture motion was filed on the campaign finance reform bill last night, with the cloture vote ordered to occur at 2:15 on Tuesday, June 25.

As a reminder, Senators have until the hour of 2 p.m. on Monday in order to file first-degree amendments, and until 12:30 on Tuesday in order to file second-degree amendments.

The Senate will also be resuming the Department of Defense authorization bill next week. Therefore, Senators can expect a busy session with rollcall votes throughout.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning business period during Monday's session be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until 2 p.m. for statements only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M., MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1996

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:18 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 24, 1996, at 1 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 21, 1996: